

NOV 23 2005

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

LILY PARRISH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

IBM, CORP.; ANTHONY SEALES,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 04-15217

D.C. No. CV-02-04075-JW

MEMORANDUM^{*}

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
James Ware, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 15, 2005^{**}
San Francisco, California

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, THOMAS, and TALLMAN, Circuit Judges.

Lily Parrish appeals from the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of her former employer, International Business Machines Corporation and

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Anthony Seales (together, “IBM”), on her discrimination and retaliation claims under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (“FEHA”).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by excluding Parrish’s proffered “Exhibit 24.” *See Orr v. Bank of Am., NT & SA*, 285 F.3d 764, 777-78 (9th Cir. 2002) (holding that Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 56(e) requires that an exhibit attached to an affidavit opposing a summary judgment motion be authenticated by the affiant’s personal knowledge).

The district court properly granted summary judgment because IBM produced evidence of a legitimate nondiscriminatory reason for terminating Parrish’s employment and Parrish failed to raise a genuine issue of disputed fact to support her claims that illegal discrimination or retaliation motivated IBM’s decision. *Guz v. Bechtel Nat., Inc.*, 8 P.3d 1089, 1115 (Cal. 2000).

AFFIRMED.